

### REMARKS

In the last Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because of the recitation in claim 1 that the bayonet structure comprises "a projected portion having a front end with a semispherical shape." To overcome this objection, claim 1 has been amended to delete the phrase "with a semispherical shape" thereby overcoming the rejection. As presently worded, claim 1 recites that the bayonet structure comprises a projected portion having a front end provided on one of the bezel and a face of the main body confronting the bezel, and a recess portion provided on the other one of the bezel and the confronting face of the main body and removably fitted to the front end of the projected portion. The present wording of claim 1 is adequately described in the specification and thus claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are in compliance with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due a lack of antecedence for the wording "the groove" and "the elastically deformable member". As noted by the Examiner, the antecedence for these

limitations appears in claim 14, and claim 15 should properly depend on claim 14 and not claim 13. In accordance with this response, claim 15 has been amended to depend on claim 14, thereby overcoming the indefiniteness rejection.

Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either Biver or Tissot, and claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biver or Tissot in further view of Eschle. Claims 4 and 19 were allowed, and claims 14-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and were otherwise indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim and if the dependency of claim 15 is corrected.

Applicants and applicants' attorney acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claims 4 and 19 and the indication of allowable subject matter concerning claims 14-17.

In accordance with this response, independent claim 12 has been amended to incorporate this subject matter of allowable claim 17 (except for the recitation of a transparent member formed over the display of the timepiece movement), thereby placing claim 12 in allowable form. As amended, claim 12 requires that the bezel affix the inner body to the outer

body by sandwiching the inner body between the outer body and the bezel, and the claim further recites a bayonet structure removably rotatably mounting the bezel to the outer body. As indicated by the Examiner, no such subject matter is disclosed or suggested by the several prior art references.

Dependent claims 13, 14 and 18 have been amended to conform to amended base claim 12. These claims are likewise believed allowable as they depend on allowable base claim 12.

Dependent claims 16 and 17 have been canceled.

It is noted that no prior art was applied against claims 1-3 and 5-11. As claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection based on failure to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, claim 1 together with dependent claims 2-3 and 5-11 are likewise believed to be in allowable form. Dependent claim 6 has been amended to improve the wording and dependent claim 11 has been amended to conform to base claim 1 and to provide proper antecedence for the recitation "the recesses" recited near the end of the claim.

Fig. 6A of the drawings has been amended to change reference numeral "32" to --33-- to correctly denote the bayonet part 33. Reference numeral 32 is correctly used in Fig. 6A to denote the mark hole. A replacement drawing sheet has been submitted to effectuate this drawing correction.

In view of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be allowable form. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS  
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams  
Reg. No. 25,886

50 Broadway - 31st Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS FEE AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Debra Buonincontri

Name

  
Signature

January 28, 2005

Date

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Submitted herewith is a replacement drawing of Figs. 6A-6B on which reference numeral 32 has been corrected to reference numeral 33 to correctly denote the bayonet part 33. Entry of the replacement drawing sheet is respectfully requested.